

GOVERNOR DIX URGES PASSING INCOME TAX

Asks That Assembly Take Action on Amendment Without Further Delay.

SENDS LETTER TO FRISBIE

Rochester Platform Pledge Meant What It Said, Declares Governor, and Should Be Kept.

Albany, May 16.—Governor Dix to-day sent a letter to Speaker Frisbie of the Assembly urging the House to take action on pending income tax amendment to the State Constitution. The Governor advises the income tax pledge of the Rochester platform is binding on the Democratic party, and in closing says that "there should not be the slightest question that our pledge will be fully redeemed, and that without further delay."

The Wagner resolution ratifying the amendment passed the Senate on April 19, and has since been held up in the Assembly's Judiciary Committee.

Governor Dix's letter follows, in part:

"Daniel D. Frisbie, Assembly Chamber, Albany, N. Y.—I cannot refrain from expressing to you my belief that the time is arrived when the Assembly should take action on the pending income tax amendment to the State Constitution.

In the hearing last week before the Judicial Committee of the Assembly, state senators made arguments advanced

that should not be allowed to go unnoticed

that were right to speak for the majority party cannot be questioned.

It is difficult to believe that any citizen

of America, having the income tax

pledge of the Rochester platform is not

upon the Democratic party, for

the reason that the language of the pledge

"an amendment, and not a

general tax," was inserted

in the original draft.

John A. DIX.

Albany, May 16, 1911.

Assemblyman Aaron J. Levy, chairman

of the Judiciary Committee, which at pres-

ent has charge of the proposed income tax

amendment to the federal constitution,

issued a statement to-night in which he

takes issue with Governor Dix.

"His excellency, the Governor, may be

entirely correct in his ideas upon this all

important and grave subject," says Mr.

Levy, "but may he not likewise be in error

in respect to this one?" Would not the

German method of collecting an income

tax and apportioning the proceeds propor-

tionately between the federal government

and the states be better than the proposed

one, where New York State would pay one-

sixth of the entire tax of the country?"

Several other questions are raised by Mr.

Levy, who concludes with a defense of the

committee, which he says has not been

hasty in consideration of the measure,

which he believes "should have the fullest

and fairest study and consideration."

privileged class is repugnant to every American principle and that all classes should bear their just share of the cost of government. He denies that the proposed tax would decrease the interest paid depositors by the savings banks of the state. New York State should be glad and proud to pay one-sixth of the whole tax if that is her rightful share, says Mr. Dix. If this is the wealthiest state it is because every state pays its tribute directly or indirectly to New York. The letter adds:

"We are told that the income tax should be left to the state and not to the source of revenue. A state income tax would be impossible and impracticable in a state tariff on imports and exports. There are certain laws which must be national in their scope in order to be beneficial and uniform in their effect. The income tax is one of these. What would happen in an income tax of lesser range, in adjacent states? It is difficult to believe that the suggestion of a state income tax is meant in good faith."

It is axiomatic that the power to tax is the power to destroy. It is also axiomatic that the power to tax is the power to distribute equally the fruits of government. This an income tax will do, but fails to assume that the federal government, if invested with the power to levy an income tax, may destroy the cities and municipalities by destroying the value of their securities or instruments. An income tax can be imposed only by Congress. Congress consists of the Senate and House of Representatives. In the Senate the House's entire representation in the House is equal to the representation in proportion to population. This gives the cities representation, proportionate to their population.

As was pointed out in The Tribune on Monday, some of the chief recommendations of the expert are:

"Illegal and Absurd." The Governor declares that the proposition that Congress might impose an income tax that would cripple the states and municipalities by destroying the value of their instrumentalities is illegal and absurd. He says, in closing:

The Democratic party in the State of New York is committed to the ratification of the pending income tax amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The ratifying of the amendment by the Assembly following the wise action of the Senate, the action of the administration, and will place the State of New York where it ought to be, in the column of ratifying states. There should not be the slightest question that the pledge will be fully redeemed, and that without further delay. JOHN A. DIX.

Albany, May 16, 1911.

Assemblyman Aaron J. Levy, chairman

of the Judiciary Committee, which at pres-

ent has charge of the proposed income tax

amendment to the federal constitution,

issued a statement to-night in which he

takes issue with Governor Dix.

"His excellency, the Governor, may be

entirely correct in his ideas upon this all

important and grave subject," says Mr.

Levy, "but may he not likewise be in error

in respect to this one?" Would not the

German method of collecting an income

tax and apportioning the proceeds propor-

tionately between the federal government

and the states be better than the proposed

one, where New York State would pay one-

sixth of the entire tax of the country?"

Several other questions are raised by Mr.

Levy, who concludes with a defense of the

committee, which he says has not been

hasty in consideration of the measure,

which he believes "should have the fullest

and fairest study and consideration."

OPPOSE ANNEXATION TO CITY

Westchester People at Hearing on McClelland Measure.

(By Telegraph to The Tribune)

Albany, May 16.—Westchester people are stirred up over the bill of Senator McClelland to annex to New York City the cities of Mount Vernon, New Rochelle and Yonkers and the towns of Pelham and East Chester, after a referendum vote.

In any form such a proposal is contemptible as a decision of the income tax in accordance with the constitutional amendment then pending, an amendment that for months had been subjected to analysis and discussion. The proposal, which the Democratic party voted to accept, is nothing but a trick to defeat and to a juggling of words in order to obtain votes. I do not and will not admit such a proposal.

But to seek to defeat the ratification of the pending amendment on the claim that the Rochester platform in its income tax pledge used the word "and" and not "nor" is to suggest that the Democratic party is willing to commit an act which would savor of perfidy and disonor. For myself and the party I repudiate the suggestion.

Calls Pledge Binding on Party.

When I accepted the nomination of the Rochester convention and the platform upon which I was nominated I did not understand or believe that the income tax pledge was a sufficient or obtainable guarantee of the income tax.

Many residents of these places appeared at a hearing on the measure before the Senate Cities Committee this afternoon. They were large white blouses, announcing "We are against annexation!" Senator McClelland declared that the report that Tammany Hall wanted this legislation was wrong. Tammany, in fact, was against it, he said.

Mayor H. E. Colvill of New Rochelle opposed the bill, declaring the city was satisfied with conditions as they are. Others who spoke against the measure were James A. Blanchard and A. M. Johnson of Mount Vernon, H. M. Harmon of New Rochelle, and John C. Ten Eyck of Yonkers. Petitions from the City Club of New Rochelle and the Westchester Board of Supervisors against it were presented by William R. Page and S. Fletcher Allen.

Those who favored the bill held that one of those results would be to bring about cheaper transportation. The advocates of the measure included J. S. Woss, of Mount Vernon, R. E. Wilcox, of Mount Vernon, and J. E. Fairchild, of Pelham Heights.

Senator Wainwright disputed the decision of Mr. Jones of Mount Vernon, that Mayor Gaynor had twice suggested annexation. When the Senator said that the Mayor must have made the suggestion merely as a joke, Mr. Jones retorted that Mayor Gaynor seldom joked.

SULLIVAN LIQUOR BILL PASSED

It Permits Selling at Certain Theatrical Places.

(By Telegraph to The Tribune)

Albany, May 16.—The Assembly to-day passed the bill of Senator "Tim" Sullivan giving the Police Department of New York the power to permit, if it sees fit, the sale of liquor at places duly licensed where "interludes, comedies, operas, ballets,远游, plays, minstrelsy or dancing or any other entertainment of the stage" are being given. The law at present gives the police the power where concerts consisting of "vocal and instrumental music only."

Those who favored the bill held that one of those results would be to bring about cheaper transportation. The advocates of the measure included J. S. Woss, of Mount Vernon, R. E. Wilcox, of Mount Vernon, and J. E. Fairchild, of Pelham Heights.

Senator Wainwright disputed the decision of Mr. Jones of Mount Vernon, that Mayor Gaynor had twice suggested annexation. When the Senator said that the Mayor must have made the suggestion merely as a joke, Mr. Jones retorted that Mayor Gaynor seldom joked.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality and to the democratic principle of opposition to privilege than an income tax so levied that it would divide the people of the United States into two classes—those subject to tax on the one hand and those not subject to tax on the other. It is matter of course that no income tax derived from whatever source derived but only on salaries earned outside of a particular place can be fairly applied in taxation in trade, commerce and financial and industrial enterprises.

It is possible to conceive any proposal more unfair and more antipathetic to the American idea of equality